

A Proposed Quantum Low Density Parity Check Code

Michael S. Postol
National Security Agency
9800 Savage Road
Fort Meade, MD 20755
Email: msposto@zombie.ncsc.mil

February 1, 2008

1 Introduction

Low density parity check codes or LDPC codes were discovered by Gallager [1] in 1962. Because of the lack of sufficient computing power at the time, these codes were largely ignored until recently. With the recent discovery of turbo codes and their iterative decoding techniques, there has been renewed interest in LDPC codes, which can also be decoded iteratively. It turns out that in many cases LDPC codes perform even better than turbo codes in achieving low bit error rates for a fixed signal-to-noise ratio.

The problem with LDPC codes is that they are usually very difficult to encode. In [2], Kou, Lin, and Fossorier address this problem by constructing LDPC codes based on finite geometries. These codes turn out to be cyclic codes, so they are very easy to encode.

Since LDPC codes by definition have sparse parity check matrices, we consider the possibility that quantum CSS codes can be constructed from them. It is hoped that these sparse matrices will lead to more fault tolerant decoding techniques, since fewer computations will produce less error.

In the next section we will define LDPC codes and present a simple decoding algorithm. Section 3 will define the finite geometries used in the codes of Kou, Lin, and Fossorier. Section 4 will define these codes and some generalizations. The final section will give a CSS code construction based on a helpful suggestion from Shu Lin.

2 Low Density Parity Check Codes

We now define low density parity check (LDPC) codes.

Definition 2.1. An *LDPC code* is a binary linear code whose parity check matrix H has the following properties:

1. Each row consists of ρ ones.
2. Each column consists of γ ones.
3. The number of ones in common between any 2 columns, denoted λ , is no greater than 1.
4. Both ρ and γ are small compared to the length of the code.

As an example consider the code with parity check matrix

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This example appears in [1]. Note that the 2 bottom sections of H are column permutations of the top section. In this case, we have that the length n of the code is 20, $\rho = 4$, $\gamma = 3$, and no two columns have more than 1 “one” in common.

Gallager gives 2 iterative decoding algorithms in his paper. The first one is extremely simple and involves hard decision bit flipping. The second is a probabilistic soft decision algorithm. We will describe the first algorithm. The reader is referred to [1] for details.

The bit flipping algorithm is as follows:

- Step 1. Compute the parity-check equations. If they are all satisfied, stop.
- Step 2. Find the number of unsatisfied parity-check equations for each bit, denoted f_i for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$.
- Step 3. Identify the set S of bits for which f_i is above some predetermined threshold.
- Step 4. Flip the bits in S .
- Step 5. Repeat steps 1 to 4 until all of the parity check equations are satisfied or a predetermined maximum number of iterations is reached.

The problem with LDPC codes is that they are very hard to encode, especially when the length n is large. Kou, Lin, and Fossorier solve this problem by constructing an LDPC code which is actually cyclic. It is very easy and efficient to encode cyclic codes.

3 Finite Geometries

We now discuss the finite geometries used in the construction of Kou, et. al. More information about finite geometries can be found in [3].

Definition 3.1. A *finite projective geometry* consists of a finite set Ω of *points* $p, q, \dots$ and a collection of subsets $L, M, \dots$ of Ω called *lines* satisfying the following axioms. (If $p \in L$, we say that p *lies on* L or L *passes through* p .)

- i. There is a unique line denoted (pq) passing through any 2 distinct points p and q .
- ii. Every line contains at least 3 points.
- iii. If distinct lines L and M have a common point p , and if q and r are points of L not equal to p , and s and t are points of M not equal to p , then the lines (qt) and (rs) also have a point in common.
- iv. For any point p there are at least two lines not containing p , and for any line L there are at least two points not on L .

Definition 3.2. A *subspace* of the projective geometry Ω is a subset S of Ω such that if p, q are distinct points of S , then S contains the line (pq) . A *hyperplane* is a maximal proper subspace of Ω .

We will also use a second type of finite geometry in our constructions.

Definition 3.3. A *Euclidean geometry* is obtained from a projective geometry by deleting the points of some fixed hyperplane.

Definition 3.4. A set T of points in a projective or Euclidean geometry is called *independent* if for every $x \in T$, x does not belong to the smallest subspace which contains $T \setminus \{x\}$.

For example, any 3 points on a line are not independent.

Definition 3.5. The *dimension* of a subspace S of a projective geometry is $r - 1$, where r is the size of the largest independent set of points of S .

Our first example of a finite geometry will be the projective geometry $PG(m, q)$.

Definition 3.6. Let $GF(q)$ be a finite field and $m \geq 2$. The points of $\Omega = PG(m, q)$ are the non-zero $(m + 1)$ -tuples $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m)$ with $a_i \in GF(q)$ such that $(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and $(\lambda a_0, \lambda a_1, \dots, \lambda a_m)$ are considered to be the same point if λ is a non-zero element of $GF(q)$. (These are called *homogeneous coordinates* for the points.)

$\Omega = PG(m, q)$ is a projective geometry of dimension m . There are $q^{m+1} - 1$ nonzero $(m+1)$ -tuples, and each point appears $q-1$ times, so Ω has

$$\frac{q^{m+1} - 1}{q - 1}$$

points.

The line through the distinct points $a = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m)$ and $b = (b_0, b_1, \dots, b_m)$ consists of the points

$$(\lambda a_0 + \mu b_0, \lambda a_1 + \mu b_1, \dots, \lambda a_m + \mu b_m)$$

where λ and μ are 2 elements of $GF(q)$ which are not both 0. A line contains $q + 1$ points since there are $q^2 - 1$ choices for λ and μ , and each point has $q - 1$ representations.

A hyperplane or subspace of dimension $m - 1$ in $PG(m, q)$ consists of those points $a = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_m)$ which satisfy an equation

$$\lambda_0 a_0 + \lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_m a_m = 0$$

where the λ_i are elements of $GF(q)$ which are not all zero. Deleting the hyperplane

$$\{(\lambda_0 a_0, \lambda_1 a_1, \dots, \lambda_m a_m) | \lambda_0 a_0 = 0\},$$

gives points which we can take to be of the form $(1, a_1, \dots, a_m)$. We call this set the *Euclidean geometry* $EG(m, q)$. $EG(m, q)$ has q^m points which can be labeled as $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$.

4 Construction of LDPC Codes From Finite Geometries

We now give the constructions of [2] for LDPC codes derived from the finite geometries of the previous section. Our first example is a class of LDPC codes based on $EG(2, 2^s)$.

Let α be a primitive element of $GF(2^{2s})$. Each nonzero element of $GF(2^{2s})$ can be written in the form α^i for some i . We can express α^i as a 2-tuple (b_i, c_i) , where b_i and c_i are in $GF(2^s)$ and $\alpha^i = b_i + c_i \alpha$. So $GF(2^{2s})$ can be thought of as the 2-dimensional Euclidean geometry $EG(2, 2^s)$. The point $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0)$ is called the *origin* of $EG(2, 2^s)$.

Let p_0, p_1 be two linearly independent points in $EG(2, 2^s)$. Then the 2^s points of the form $p_0 + \beta p_1$ with $\beta \in GF(2^s)$ form a line passing through p_0 .

If p_2 is linearly independent of both p_0 and p_1 , then the lines $\{p_0 + \beta p_1\}$ and $\{p_0 + \beta p_2\}$ intersect in the point p_0 . Any two lines are identical or have no more than one point in common.

Given a point p_0 in $EG(2, 2^s)$, there are

$$\frac{2^{2s} - 1}{2^s - 1} = 2^s + 1$$

lines intersecting at p_0 , including the line βp_0 passing through the origin. There are $2^s - 1$ lines parallel to any given line. (I.e. they have no points in common.) So $EG(2, 2^s)$ has $2^s(2^s + 1)$ distinct lines.

Given a line L and a primitive element α of $GF(2^{2s})$, let

$$v_L = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{2^{2s}-2})$$

be a binary $(2^{2s} - 1)$ -tuple with $v_i = 1$ if α^i is a point on L , and $v_i = 0$ otherwise. v_L is called the *incidence vector* of the line L .

Now form the parity check matrix H for our LDPC code. H is a $(2^{2s} - 1) \times (2^{2s} - 1)$ matrix whose rows are the incidence vectors of the

$$2^s(2^s + 1) - (2^s + 1) = 2^{2s} - 1$$

lines in $EG(2, 2^s)$ not passing through the origin.

The parity check matrix H has the following properties:

1. Each row has $\rho = 2^s$ ones since there are 2^s points on any line.
2. Each column corresponds to a non-origin point in $EG(2, 2^s)$ and has $\gamma = 2^s$ lines passing through it. (Excluding the line through the origin.)
3. Any 2 columns have one and only one "1" in common (i.e. $\lambda = 1$) since given any 2 points, there is a unique line passing through these 2 points.

Definition 4.1. The *density* of a matrix H is the ratio r of the total number of ones of H to the total number of entries in H .

The parity check matrix for our code has a density

$$r = \frac{2^s}{2^{2s} - 1}.$$

The density is very small for large values of s .

It turns out that we can construct H by writing down one row and circularly shifting to obtain all of the other rows. So we actually have a *cyclic* code, which has an easy encoding algorithm.

We will now give an example. In order to understand it, we will need the following table of $GF(16)$ generated using the primitive polynomial $\alpha^4 + \alpha + 1 = 0$.

as a 4-tuple	as a polynomial	as a power of α
1000	1	1
0100	α	α
0010	α^2	α^2
0001	α^3	α^3
1100	$1 + \alpha$	α^4
0110	$\alpha + \alpha^2$	α^5
0011	$\alpha^2 + \alpha^3$	α^6
1101	$1 + \alpha + \alpha^3$	α^7
1010	$1 + \alpha^2$	α^8
0101	$\alpha + \alpha^3$	α^9
1110	$1 + \alpha + \alpha^2$	α^{10}
0111	$\alpha + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3$	α^{11}
1111	$1 + \alpha + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3$	α^{12}
1011	$1 + \alpha^2 + \alpha^3$	α^{13}
1001	$1 + \alpha^3$	α^{14}

Example 4.1. Let $s = 2$. Let $GF(2^{2(2)}) = GF(16)$ be generated by the primitive polynomial $X^4 + X + 1 = 0$. This is the 2-dimensional Euclidean geometry $EG(2, 2^2)$ over $GF(2^2)$

Let α be a primitive element in $GF(2^{2(2)})$ and let $\beta = \alpha^5$. Then $\{0, 1, \beta, \beta^2\}$ form the subfield $GF(2^2)$.

Every line in $EG(2, 2^2)$ consists of 4 points. Letting $p_0 = \alpha^{14}$ gives the line $\{\alpha^{14} + \eta\alpha\}$ where η ranges over $GF(2^2)$. Now the 4 values of η are

$$\{0, 1, \beta, \beta^2\} = \{0, 1, \alpha^5, \alpha^{10}\}.$$

The 4 points on the line are now computed using the table.

$$\alpha^{14} + 0\alpha = \alpha^{14}$$

$$\alpha^{14} + 1\alpha = \alpha^{14} + \alpha \equiv 1001 \oplus 0100 = 1101 \equiv \alpha^7$$

$$\alpha^{14} + \alpha^5\alpha = \alpha^{14} + \alpha^6 \equiv 1001 \oplus 0011 = 1010 \equiv \alpha^8$$

$$\alpha^{14} + \alpha^{10}\alpha = \alpha^{14} + \alpha^{11} \equiv 1001 \oplus 0111 = 1110 \equiv \alpha^{10}$$

So our line is the set

$$\{\alpha^7, \alpha^8, \alpha^{10}, \alpha^{14}\}$$

with incidence vector (000000011010001). The parity check matrix for our LDPC code is now

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 000000011010001 \\ 000000110100010 \\ 000001101000100 \\ 000011010001000 \\ 000110100010000 \\ 001101000100000 \\ 011010001000000 \\ 110100010000000 \\ 101000100000001 \\ 010001000000011 \\ 100010000000110 \\ 000100000001101 \\ 001000000011010 \\ 010000000110100 \\ 100000001101000 \end{pmatrix}$$

The code based on $EG(2, 2^s)$ has the following parameters:

- Length: $n = 2^{2s} - 1$.
- Number of parity bits: $n - k = 3^s - 1$.
- Dimension: $k = 2^{2s} - 3^s$.
- Minimum Distance: $d = 2^s + 1$, so the code can correct 2^{s-1} errors.

Example 4.2. Let $s = 7$. We have an LDPC code based on $EG(2, 2^7)$.

This is a (16383,14197) code with minimum distance 129, so it can correct 64 errors.

The parity check matrix H has $\rho = \gamma = 128$, $\lambda = 1$, and density $r = .007813$

The rate $R = k/n$ of this code is $14197/16383 \approx .867$. If we increase s , the rate of the resulting code quickly approaches 1, so these codes are extremely efficient.

We now describe a family of LDPC codes based on the projective geometries $PG(2, 2^s)$. Let α be a primitive element of $GF(2^{3s})$. Let

$$n = \frac{2^{3s} - 1}{2^s - 1} = 2^{2s} + 2^s + 1$$

If $\beta = \alpha^n$, then β has order $2^s - 1$. The elements $0, 1, \beta, \beta^2, \dots, \beta^{2^s-2}$ form the subfield $GF(2^s)$.

Partition the elements of $GF(2^{3s})$ into n disjoint subsets of the form:

$$\{\alpha^i, \beta\alpha^i, \beta^2\alpha^i, \dots, \beta^{2^s-2}\alpha^i\} \text{ with } 0 \leq i \leq n.$$

For each i represent this set as (α^i) . For any $\alpha^j \in GF(2^{3s})$, if $\alpha^j = \beta^k\alpha^i$ with $0 \leq i \leq n$, then we represent α^j by (α^i) . The n elements of the form (α^i) are taken to be the points of $PG(2, 2^s)$.

If (α^i) and (α^j) are 2 distinct points of $PG(2, 2^s)$, then the line L passing through them consists of points of the form $(z_1\alpha^i + z_2\alpha^j)$, where z_1 and z_2 are elements of $GF(2^s)$ at least one of which is nonzero. Since $(z_1\alpha^i + z_2\alpha^j)$ and $(\beta^k z_1\alpha^i + \beta^k z_2\alpha^j)$ are the same point, the line L consists of

$$\frac{(2^s)^2 - 1}{2^s - 1} = 2^s + 1 \text{ points.}$$

Let (α^m) be a point which is not on the line $(z_1\alpha^i + z_2\alpha^j)$. Then the lines $(z_1\alpha^i + z_2\alpha^j)$ and $(z_1\alpha^m + z_2\alpha^j)$ intersect at the point (α^j) . The number of lines in $PG(2, 2^s)$ intersecting at the point (α^j) is

$$\frac{2^{2s} - 1}{2^s - 1} = 2^s + 1$$

There are $2^{2s} + 2^s + 1$ distinct lines in $PG(2, 2^s)$.

Given a line L , let $v_L = (v_0, v_1, \dots, v_{n-1})$ be a binary n -tuple with $v_i = 1$ if (α^i) is a point of L , and $v_i = 0$ otherwise. Then v_L is the incidence vector of the line L .

We now can form an LDPC code whose parity check matrix H is a $(2^{2s} + 2^s + 1) \times (2^{2s} + 2^s + 1)$ matrix whose rows are the incidence vectors of the $2^{2s} + 2^s + 1$ lines in $PG(2, 2^s)$.

The parity check matrix H has the following properties:

1. Each row has $\rho = 2^s + 1$ ones since there are $2^s + 1$ points on any line.
2. Each column corresponds to a point in $PG(2, 2^s)$, and $\gamma = 2^s + 1$, since any point has $2^s + 1$ lines passing through it.
3. Any 2 columns have one and only one "1" in common (i.e. $\lambda = 1$) since given any 2 points, there is a unique line passing through these 2 points.

The density of H is

$$r = \frac{2^s + 1}{2^{2s} + 2^s + 1},$$

a very small number for large values of s .

As in the case of the code based on $EG(2, 2^s)$, we can construct H by writing down one row and circularly shifting to obtain all of the other rows. So in this case, we also have a cyclic code.

The code based on $PG(2, 2^s)$ has the following parameters:

- Length: $n = 2^{2s} + 2^s + 1$.
- Number of parity bits: $n - k = 3^s + 1$.
- Dimension: $k = 2^{2s} + 2^s - 3^s$.
- Minimum Distance: $d = 2^s + 2$, so the code can correct 2^{s-1} errors.

Example 4.3. Let $s = 7$. We have an LDPC code based on $PG(2, 2^7)$. This is a (16513, 14325) code with minimum distance 130, so it can correct 64 errors. The parity check matrix H has $\rho = \gamma = 129$, $\lambda = 1$, and density $r = .007812$. The rate of this code is $R = .867$, comparable to the code based on $EG(2, 2^7)$.

We will now briefly describe some generalizations given in [2]. They involve puncturing, extensions, or higher dimensional geometries.

We first look at puncturing. Consider a LDPC code based on $EG(2, 2^s)$. Choose a line L in $EG(2, 2^s)$ and remove the columns of H corresponding to the 2^s points in L . We now have a matrix with $2^{2s} - 2^s - 1$ columns and an all zero row. Removing this row gives a $(2^{2s} - 2) \times (2^{2s} - 2^s - 1)$ parity check matrix.

The new parity check matrix has $\gamma = 2^s$ ones in each column. The rows have 2^s or $2^s - 1$ ones depending on whether the lines intersect the original line L . We still have that any 2 columns have exactly one “1” in common.

The corresponding code is called an *irregular* LDPC code, since not every row has the same weight.

We can also remove multiple parallel lines to get even shorter codes or puncture LDPC codes based on $PG(2, 2^s)$.

We can extend our LDPC codes by means of *column splitting*. Given an LDPC code of length n with parity check matrix H , we create a new code of length qn . Our new parity check matrix H_{ext} is formed by replacing each column of H by q columns with $2 \leq q \leq 2^s$ for a code based on $EG(2, 2^s)$ or $2 \leq q \leq 2^s + 1$ for a code based on $PG(2, 2^s)$.

As an example, for a code based on $EG(2, 2^s)$, write $2^s = \gamma q + b$ with $0 \leq b < q$. Each column is the same length as the original and b of them contain $\gamma + 1$ ones, while $q - b$ of them contain γ ones. The ones are put into the columns in a rotating fashion. We illustrate this technique with the following example:

Example 4.4. Let $s = 2$, so $2^s = 4$, and let $q = 3$. We then have $4 = 3\gamma + b$ so $\gamma = 1$ and $b = 1$.

So the column

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ becomes } \begin{pmatrix} 100 \\ 000 \\ 000 \\ 010 \\ 001 \\ 000 \\ 000 \\ 100 \\ 000 \\ 000 \\ 010 \\ 001 \\ 000 \\ 000 \\ 100 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Extension gives a $(2^{2s} - 1) \times q(2^{2s} - 1)$ parity check matrix H_{ext} with the following properties:

1. Each row has weight 2^s .
2. Each column has weight $\lfloor \frac{2^s}{q} \rfloor$ or $\lfloor \frac{2^s}{q} \rfloor + 1$.
3. Any 2 columns have at most one “1” in common.

We can construct extensions of codes based on $PG(2, 2^s)$ in a similar manner. Extending the codes increases the code rate and improves performance. Note that puncturing and extension can be used in combination.

Finally, we mention that we can generalize all of the codes we have described for $EG(2, 2^s)$ and $PG(2, 2^s)$ to codes based on the higher dimensional geometries $EG(m, 2^s)$ and $PG(m, 2^s)$ for $m > 2$. See [2] for the details.

5 Quantum LDPC Codes

Quantum codes arise in a natural way from classical codes. We examined the possibility of forming a quantum LDPC code based on the finite geometry construction. The quantum construction we used was the well known *Calderbank-Shor-Steane* or *CSS* codes. These codes are described in many places in the quantum computing literature. We will use the definition found in [4].

Definition 5.1. Suppose C_1 and C_2 are $[n, k_1]$ and $[n, k_2]$ classical linear codes such that $C_2 \subset C_1$ and C_1 and $C_2^\perp$ both correct t errors. We will define an $[n, k_1 - k_2]$ quantum code $CSS(C_1, C_2)$

capable of correcting errors on t qubits. We call this the *CSS code of C_1 over C_2* . The construction is as follows: If x is a codeword in C_1 define the quantum state $|x + C_2\rangle$ by

$$|x + C_2\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{|C_2|}} \sum_{y \in C_2} |x + y\rangle.$$

Here $|C_2|$ denotes the number of codewords in C_2 and $x + y$ denotes bitwise addition modulo 2. The quantum code $CSS(C_1, C_2)$ is defined to be the vector space spanned by the states $|x + C_2\rangle$ for all $x \in C_1$. Note that $|x + C_2\rangle = |z + C_2\rangle$ if and only if x and z lie in the same coset of C_2 in C_1 . The number of cosets of C_2 in C_1 is $|C_1|/|C_2|$, so $CSS(C_1, C_2)$ is an $[n, k_1 - k_2]$ quantum code.

We can think of C_1 as correcting the bit flip errors and $C_2^\perp$ as correcting the phase errors. (See [4] for an explanation of why this works.)

In order to construct a quantum version of a LDPC code, we needed to find families of these codes in which codes of the same length nest in a natural way, and whose duals are easy to describe. The finite geometry codes are cyclic, so they have easy to describe duals. The problem was in finding a way to nest these codes.

In a private conversation, Professor Shu Lin, one of the coauthors of [2], suggested splitting rows of the parity check matrix in a manner similar to the column splitting extension technique we described in section 4. This leads to a code with a larger null space and hence a smaller code. The code produced is still a cyclic code, so it is still easy to find its dual.

The technique is best illustrated with an example.

Example 5.1. Consider the LDPC code given in Example 4.1. The code was a $[15, 7]$ cyclic code. We gave the parity check matrix H in the example. Now split the rows of H using $q = 2$ to produce a 30×15 matrix H_{ext} . As an example, the first row

$$(000000011010001)$$

of H becomes the first 2 rows

$$\begin{pmatrix} 000000010010000 \\ 000000001000001 \end{pmatrix}$$

of H_{ext} . Using Mathematica, we row reduced the resulting matrix and determined that the new code has a check polynomial $h(x) = x^3 + 1$ and that the row space of H has dimension 12, so the new code has dimension 3.

Now let C_1 be the original code and C_2 be the code generated by row splitting. We know that $C_2 \subset C_1$. So we have a CSS code where bit flips are corrected by C_1 and phase shifts are corrected by $C_2^\perp$. The CSS code is a $[15, 7 - 3] = [15, 4]$ quantum code.

Now C_1 is an LDPC code. What can we say about $C_2^\perp$? Since C_2 has a check polynomial $h(x) = x^3 + 1$, $C_2^\perp$ has a generator polynomial $g^\perp(x) = x^3(\frac{1}{x^3} + 1) = x^3 + 1$. (See [3].) So the check polynomial for $C_2^\perp$ is

$$h^\perp(x) = \frac{x^{15} + 1}{x^3 + 1} = 1 + x^3 + x^6 + x^9 + x^{12}$$

(The division is taken modulo 2.) We then have the parity check matrix

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This matrix has the following properties:

1. Each row has $\rho = 5$ ones.
2. Each column has $\gamma = 1$ ones.
3. Any 2 columns have one and only one "1" in common (i.e. $\lambda = 1$).

So $C_2^\perp$ is actually an LDPC code. This means that bit flip errors and phase flip errors are both corrected by LDPC codes.

The density of the parity check matrix for $C_2^\perp$ is $15/45 \approx .33$, which is a little more than the density $4/15 \approx .27$ for C_1 .

6 Conclusions

We have shown that we can use the finite geometry construction of LDPC codes to construct CSS codes. The CSS codes fix both bit flip and phase shift errors with LDPC codes. There is still a need to develop a general theory describing these codes. It is also hoped that the relatively simple decoding algorithm for LDPC codes will lead to more fault tolerant decoding algorithms for these CSS codes. Our initial example shows that this may be a promising research area.

References

- [1] R. Gallager, "Low-Density Parity-Check Codes," IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, January 1962, pp. 21-28.
- [2] Y. Kou, S. Lin, and M. Fossorier, "Low Density Parity Check Codes Based on Finite Geometries: A Rediscovery and More," Submitted to IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, October 12, 1999.
- [3] F. J. MacWilliams and N. J. A. Sloane, The Theory of Error Correcting Codes, North Holland, 1977.
- [4] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, 2000.